



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/067,610

02/04/2002

Rafie Shamsaasef

D2684

5884

43471 7590 01/18/2007

GENERAL INSTRUMENT CORPORATION DBA THE CONNECTED
HOME SOLUTIONS BUSINESS OF MOTOROLA, INC.
101 TOURNAMENT DRIVE
HORSHAM, PA 19044

EXAMINER

OKORONKWO, CHINWENDU C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/18/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/067,610	Applicant(s) SHAMSAASEF ET AL.	
	Examiner Chinwendu C. Okoronkwo	Art Unit 2136	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12/15/2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: _____.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments regarding the citations used within the Final Rejection (10/16/2006). In response to the arguments that "the holder within the citations do not issue a service ticket and that server A does not receive requests for access information to access content, the Examiner again cites paragraphs 0043 and 0045 which clearly recites, "client 202 forward[ing] the service [request] ticket to server A 210 (0043)" which then "sends a TGS_REQ message 230 to authentication service 206. TGS_REQ message 230 includes the TGT for server A 210 and the service ticket received from client 202, and identifies the desired or targeted server/service to which client 202 is seeking access, e.g., server C 214. In Kerberos, for example, there is a defined extensible data field, which is typically referred to as the "additional tickets" field. This additional tickets field can be used in the S4U2proxy protocol to carry the service ticket received from client 202, and a KDC options field can include a flag or other indicator that instructs the receiving KDC to look in the additional tickets field for a ticket to be used to supply a client identity. Those skilled in the art will recognize that these or other fields and/or data structures can be used to carry the necessary information to authentication service 206 (0045)." In essence server A does indeed receive a request for access information by means of the service ticket it receives from client 202 which includes within the TGT a set of "additional fields' and/or data structures" which are used to carry the identifying access information for the client seeking access to content. The server A 210 in turn issues these items by passing them to the authentication server 206, which ultimately determines whether access is allowed. Brezak et al. goes further to provide an instance of the invention when the access allowance is determined by only server A in paragraphs 0055-0057.

In response to the Applicant's arguments regarding the key reply in response to the client key request the Examiner cites one of several disclosure of this found within the Kato reference (column 11 lines 1-27). The motivation for use of this reference has been expounded upon in previous office actions mailed 10/16/2006 and 4/5/2006.

After considering the arguments in light of the explanations above the Examiner maintains the rejection of the claims based on the merits of the references of record.

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


1/16/07